

social action

LIBRARY
SCHOOL
SECTION



CRISES IN THE UN

social action

October, 1961

contents



- 5 THE CHANGING FACE OF THE UN
AND ITS EFFECT ON AMERICAN
OPINION
By Francis O. Wilcox
- 14 GROWING EDGES OF THE UNITED
NATIONS
By Richard M. Fagley
- DEPARTMENTS
- Editorial, 3
 - Book Reviews, 30
 - Program Planning, 32
 - Resources for Worship, 34
 - Social Action Calendar, 36

Photographs—courtesy, United Nations.

ELIZABETH JOHNS, Editor • ELIZABETH HENLEY, Assistant to the Editor • CHESTER TANAKA, Art Editor • EDITORIAL BOARD: Walter S. Press, Chairman; Elmer J. F. Arndt; Mrs. John C. Bennett; Richard M. Fagley; Ray Gibbons; Huber F. Klemme; Herman F. Reissig; F. Nelsen Schlegel, and Daniel Day Williams.

• **Subscriptions**, \$2.00 per year; \$3.75 for two years; \$5.00 for three years; five or more yearly subscriptions to one address at \$1.50 each; single copies, 25c; 10 to 99 copies at 20c; 100 or more copies at 15c. Editorial and Subscription Offices: 289 Park Avenue South, New York 10, New York • Copyright, 1961 by the COUNCIL FOR CHRISTIAN SOCIAL ACTION.

• **Social Action** is published monthly except in June, July and August by the Council for Christian Social Action of the United Church of Christ, which continues the work of the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches and of the Commission on Christian Social Action of the Evangelical and Reformed Church. *Chairman*, HUGO W. THOMPSON; *Vice-Chairman*, HENRY C. KOCH; *Director*, RAY GIBBONS; *Associate Director*, HUBER F. KLEMME; *International Relations*, HERMAN F. REISSIG; *Racial and Cultural Relations*, CHESTER L. MARCUS and GALEN R. WEAVER; *Field Secretary*, F. NELSEN SCHLEGEL; and *Publications*, ELIZABETH JOHNS • **OFFICES**: 289 Park Avenue South, New York 10, New York and 2969 West 25th Street, Cleveland 13, Ohio • **Publication Office**: 10th & Scull Streets, Lebanon, Pa. • Re-entered as second class matter August 1957 at the Post Office at Lebanon, Pa., under the act of March 3, 1879.



ARTICLE I OF THE CHARTER the purposes of the United Nations are listed as follows:

1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;

2. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principles of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;

3. To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and

4. To be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends.

In the sixteen years since these purposes were determined by men and nations immediately following World War II many problems have been confronted and much has changed. Military expenditures in both the United States and Russia have grown to staggering proportions. Whereas during World War II bombing planes could carry a little over 20 tons of TNT, today modern strategic bombers can carry H-bombs with a destructive force of 20 million tons of TNT. Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr in the introduction to *COMMUNITY OF FEAR* reminds us that the most terrifying arms race in history is proceeding at an ever more accelerated pace. We surely cannot minimize the dimension of the problem. We are all involved in a community of common predicament and peril. The need for an international organization which will continue to provide a forum for discussion, negotia-

tion, and understanding, that will work for peace and security, was never greater.

The record of these sixteen years shows that UN action is action for peace. Through the specialized agencies much has been done on economic and social development, the status of women, the attainment of human rights, and the fight against poverty and disease "for harmonizing the action of nations in the attainment of common ends." The United States, as Dean Wilcox states in his article, is bearing a large percentage of the budget. Yet our per capita cost in 1960 was only 67 cents, surely a small price to pay for this crucial channel for peace.

We are aware that the UN has weaknesses that must be recognized; careful consideration of suggestions for strengthening the organization is imperative. These Dr. Fagley deals with along with his discussion of positive illustrations of the growth and developments that are encouraging. The UN is a living organism that needs nurture so it can grow and provide the kind of instrument for peace imperative if we are to prevent the terrifying self-destruction now a live possibility in our world.

As this magazine goes to press the United Nations is involved in a number of critical tests, facing problems of enormous proportions, and undergoing much criticism in the United States. Is this of concern to the churches? In his recent book *UNDER ORDERS* Dr. Roswell Barnes of the World Council of Churches reminds us that "no aspect of the life of society or the individual's experience is outside or beyond the rule of God and therefore not outside or beyond the concern of the church, which is committed to seek, interpret, and to do His will." He points up one of the responsibilities of the laity clearly when he affirms that "the layman is at the frontier where the church meets the world. It is he primarily who must penetrate the secular order with the Gospel." Clearly it is the responsibility and privilege of the churches to corral all available resources to inform public opinion concerning the role of the United Nations in our time. Let us carry on this work of discussion and encounter at the deepest levels to undergird it in this new thermonuclear world in which we are destined to live—or die.

**If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day,
the things that belong unto thy peace! but now they are
hid from thine eyes (Luke 19:42).**



The changing face of the UN and its effect on American opinion

When Ambassador Adlai Stevenson appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on January 18, 1961, he made the following comment about the United Nations:

So we must, I believe, cherish, preserve, strengthen this great experiment in international collaboration in these days of savage attack and severe testing. We should use it not as a device in this cold war, not just in defensive reaction to Soviet initiatives, but affirmatively to advance its great purposes—

by Francis O. Wilcox, Dean, School of Advanced International Studies, The Johns Hopkins University, 1906 Florida Avenue, N.W., Washington 9, D. C.

to liberate man from the scourges of war, poverty, disease, ignorance and oppression.

To those of us who believe in the purposes and principles of the United Nations this is an encouraging statement. It indicates that, in spite of the profound changes and severe crises now besetting that organization, our government will continue to give its strong support to the United Nations as man's best hope for world peace.

"That is all very well," the skeptic will argue, "but what about the American people? Suppose the United States has to relinquish its position of influence and leadership in the United Nations and begins to lose important votes in the General Assembly? Or, even more to the point, suppose our objections are overruled and Communist China is admitted as a member? Won't developments like these bring about strong opposition to the UN, perhaps even a resumption of the campaign to withdraw from the United Nations?"

Bi-partisan support for UN

In fact, for the past sixteen years—ever since the resounding 89-2 Senate vote approving the Charter—the United Nations has been one of our most popular foreign policy ventures. Public opinion polls show that most people in both major political parties, in all parts of the country, seem to approve our membership and our participation in the United Nations.

This popular support, which has been reflected in Congress, has been a great source of strength for the United Nations. It has enabled our government to play a courageously constructive role in such crises as Korea, Suez and Congo. It has made possible American financial support that amounts to about one-half of the total expenditures of the United Nations. And it has stimulated our leadership in such great humane ventures as the UN Technical Assistance Program, the Children's Fund, the Special Fund and the Palestine Refugee Program.

The basic question

The question is how deep this devotion to principle lies. Will our people lose faith in the United Nations—perhaps even turn against it—if it falters in its important task of maintaining world peace?

THE ENLARGED MEMBERSHIP

Some Americans are already deeply disturbed over the changing character of UN membership. An organization that started out with 51 members 16 years ago now has 99 countries in its fold. With still other new states or territories like Tanganyika, Mauritania, Sierra Leone, the West Indian Federation, Kuwait, and Kenya in the wings almost ready to come on the stage, that number may well grow to 110 within the next year or two.

Last fall 16 new African states were admitted. The net result is that the African states alone now number 25—the largest single regional grouping of states in the Organization.

Many people have seriously questioned whether this enlarged world organization can remain a useful instrument for promoting either the national interests of the United States or the cause of world peace. "With the states of Asia and Africa now constituting 46 per cent of the total membership," the argument runs, "isn't it likely that the United States will increasingly find itself in an embarrassing minority? Won't the Afro-Asian group be inclined to vote against the interests of the free world? Can we trust the future of world peace to the whims and caprices of an increasingly large and unwieldy organ like the General Assembly?"

Prospects for bloc voting

There are two points I would like to make about this problem. In the first place, it is not true that the states of Asia and Africa regularly vote together as a solid bloc. The only "bloc" we have in the United Nations—whose members vote together with monolithic regularity—is the Soviet bloc. Actually there are more differences than there are similarities among the Asian-African countries, differences in history, religion, language and culture, as well as political and economic interests. Like other members of the UN they will be inclined to vote as their national interests dictate in each particular case.

It goes almost without saying that we should expect the Asian-African states to approach certain questions with a considerable amount of solidarity. This is particularly true of racial issues, problems of economic development, and questions relating to colonialism. The fact remains, however, that many countries like Japan, the Philippines, Thailand, Malaya, Pakistan,

Iran, Turkey, Tunisia, and Liberia—to mention a few—lean much more toward the West in their thinking than toward the communist bloc.

Significance for U.S.

In the second place, the expanded size of the General Assembly presents the United States with both challenges and opportunities. With 100 members we shall certainly have to work much harder than we have in the past in order to win support for our program and achieve our objectives.

But I think it is a fallacy to assume that the United States is suddenly going to find itself in an embarrassed minority in the General Assembly. If we will continue to give our strong support to the United Nations, and if we will make clear by our words and our deeds that we are sympathetic to the needs and aspirations of the underdeveloped states, we will not be short of votes when the really crucial tests arise.

In this connection I would add that far too much has been said in the press about whether we are on the winning or the losing side of votes in the General Assembly. We should remember that we are not playing a football game in the United Nations. Nor are we engaged in a popularity contest. What we are trying to do is to advance the cause of world peace; and we should not mistake a temporary parliamentary victory for solid progress toward our long-range goals.

THE PROBLEM OF COMMUNIST CHINA

Another change in the United Nations which would give the American public even greater concern is the seating of Communist China. This would not have been quite so clear were it not for the fact that we have recently gone through a national election. During that time our major political parties pulled out all the stops. Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Nixon made numerous speeches in which they denounced the Red Chinese and opposed their admission to the United Nations. The two party platforms were equally negative. And not to be outdone, Vice President Johnson, when he visited Formosa in April, made clear that no change in our China policy was in prospect. Late in July the Senate unanimously voted against the seating of Red China.

During this time the rest of the world seemed to be moving in the other direction. To be sure the 15th General Assembly

Followed in the footsteps of past Assemblies and voted to shelve the question of seating Communist China for another year. But the voting margin was uncomfortably close and some countries voted with us only because we wanted them to.

Whatever one may feel about the merits of the case, the fact is that the new Administration will run into serious difficulties in its attempt to evolve a China policy that can reconcile the hard pressures of domestic politics with the inexorable trend of world events. Perhaps, with the continued support of our loyal friends, we can stave off defeat for yet another year. Or perhaps we can carve out a new tactical position in the Assembly that will result in putting the blame for the China impasse where it belongs—in the lap of the Communist Chinese government itself.

Our opposition assessed

The fact remains, however, that there would be bitter resentment in this country if Red China were seated over our opposition. The result could be a serious handicap for the future of the United Nations if it brought in its wake a substantial loss of support among the American people. One can imagine now the hue and cry that would be raised by various groups and organizations in this country to "get the U.S. out of the UN and the UN out of the U.S."

Pressure to withdraw from the United Nations could, I think, successfully be resisted. There are a good many reasons why the United States would find it compulsory to remain a member even if Red China were seated.

Danger in U.S. withdrawal

In the first place, we cannot expect to win the cold war by running away from the battlefield. The United Nations, as it approaches universality, is destined to become—even more than it has been—the crossroads of the nations. In the circumstances, the Soviet Union would like nothing better than for us to withdraw in favor of the communist cause.

In the second place, ever since the end of World War II, our country has been working hard to establish democratic principles as the foundation of the international community. To walk out of an international organization because of an unfav-

orable vote would not only be unthinkable; it would constitute a repudiation by the United States of those great principles we have been striving so hard to achieve.

Real issue—quality of support

Finally, world peace has become a desperate imperative, and our stake in that peace is very high. So long as the United Nations remains man's best hope to avert nuclear conflict, we have no real alternative but to stick with it.

The real danger, therefore, lies not in American withdrawal. It lies rather in the kind of half-hearted, uncertain, grudging support that might result if certain important groups or elements in this country were to lose faith in the United Nations.

THE RUSSIAN ATTITUDE

In this connection there is still a third factor we should not lose sight of and that is the concerted attempts of the Soviet Union to gain control of the Organization. Much attention has been called to Mr. Khrushchev's bitter attack upon Mr. Hammarskjöld and his proposal to replace the Secretary-General by three Secretaries-General, each armed with a veto. This would, if it were accepted, drastically reduce the effectiveness of the Secretariat and strip the United Nations of much of its vitality.

Small nations support UN

Fortunately the Khrushchev proposal has not had much support outside the Soviet bloc. The smaller states—who have everything to lose and nothing to gain if the Organization is weakened—have stood out in favor of an effective United Nations with an effective Secretary-General.

Meanwhile, the Soviet Union has continued its crusade in a number of other directions. It has refused to contribute its fair share of the expenses of the Congo operation, thus attempting to extend its veto to the work of the General Assembly. It has insisted, although not successfully, upon the principle of parity to the end that the communist states might receive representation equal to that of the free world on the committees and commissions of the United Nations. It has worked hard to gain for itself and its satellites positions of prestige and influence in the Organization. It has shown renewed and aggressive interest in

the activities of the Specialized Agencies. It has insisted that at least 50 Russians be placed in top posts in the Secretariat.

No one of these steps, considered by itself, would constitute a serious threat to the integrity of the United Nations. But taken together they demonstrate the importance which the Russians attach to the offensive they have mounted. I would not want to predict how far this offensive will go. We do know from bitter experience, however, that whenever Soviet leaders get their foot in a door they do not take it out unless someone steps on their corns.

Veto in new form

The latest Soviet proposal is the "troika" policy. With respect to nuclear test inspections this means that international controls would be exercised by representatives of the Communist states, the uncommitted countries, and the free world working together, each one armed with a built-in veto. With respect to world affairs generally it means that Soviet leaders do not intend to subject the Soviet Union to any joint action which affects the vital interests of their country unless they have the right to cast the deciding vote.

This is the veto principle in a new and expanded form. If this position is firmly held, it will not only make serious negotiations between the communist states and the West practically impossible; it will do irreparable damage to the whole fabric of international relations that has been laboriously built up since the turn of the century.

All this is in line with the general attitude of the Soviet Union towards the United Nations. They have never supported an effective international organization because they realize that such an organization would seriously hamper their announced goal of winning the world to communism. They want to be free to stir up trouble in various parts of the world without the restraining influence of a strong United Nations.

CONCLUDING COMMENT

This much is clear to me. During the next few years—in a world torn by cold war friction and strife—the United Nations will be facing some of the most serious crises in its history. If it is to survive as a meaningful agency for world peace, it

will need the support of the American people as it has never needed it before.

Saint Paul has reminded us that we should "follow after the things that make for peace." He has also reminded us that we should "hate that which is evil; hold to that which is good."

Long-range objectives important

In our relations with the United Nations we must never allow ourselves to be swayed unduly by occasional setbacks or temporary misfortunes. Above all we certainly do not want to be typed as a "fair-weather" friend of the United Nations—anxious and willing to help when things are going our way but resentful and uncooperative if the tide should begin to turn. Long-range objectives are far more important than day to day successes and failures.

In simple terms the Charter dedicates the United Nations to the maintenance of peace; to the development of friendly relations between nations; and to international cooperation in the solution of the major problems which beset mankind. We Americans may have our differences—and some of them are sharp ones—but we all ought to be able to subscribe to goals like these. The fact is our national aims and the aims of the United Nations are basically the same.

UN destiny

I do not mean to suggest that American loyalty to the United Nations is all that is necessary to insure the success of the Organization. It is, I believe, an indispensable element; but so is the continuing understanding and support of the smaller nations. Indeed it can be argued that the destiny of the United Nations lies in their hands. If they play their role with courage and conviction, and if they will stand up for what is right, they can do much to assure for the United Nations a reasonably bright future.

The fact remains, however, that many of the smaller countries will continue to look to the United States for leadership and direction. We must not fail them.

When the Charter was drafted in 1945, representatives of some 42 national non-governmental organizations were present in San Francisco to advise the United States Delegation and to

strengthen its hand. Since that time these groups—and others—have followed the work of the United Nations and have helped to develop the kind of public understanding and support in this country the Organization needed to succeed.

The point of no return

These organizations are now faced with a new and urgent challenge. The future of the United Nations is at stake. Either we move ahead towards a regime of law and order under the United Nations or we begin to fall back to that point of no return where every state works selfishly for its own interests and brute force is the final arbiter.

In this great task the church can be extremely helpful, as it has been, in dispelling ignorance and fear and encouraging a better understanding of the United Nations and the principles for which it stands. This is a challenge which we must all accept in the interests of world peace.

The exclusively international character of the Secretariat is not tied to its composition, but to the spirit in which it works and to its insulation from outside influences as stated in Article 100. While it may be said that no man is neutral in the sense that he is without opinions or ideals, it is just as true that, in spite of this, a neutral Secretariat is possible. Anyone of integrity, not subjected to undue pressures, can, regardless of his own views, readily act in an "exclusively international" spirit and can be guided in his actions on behalf of the Organization solely by its interests and principles and by the instructions of its organs.

—Excerpt from Introduction to the Annual Report of the Secretary-General on the Work of the Organization, June 16, 1960-June 15, 1961.

GROWING EDGES OF THE U



If we see the United Nations as a living organism, the perspective may help us find a balanced and realistic view of this still youthful international organization now completing its sixteenth year. Many people, especially in America and in the poorer societies, have optimistic illusions and excessive expectations concerning the UN. They fail to see the extent to which it is conditioned and limited by its environment of clashing national states and power blocs. On the other hand, many people, particularly those who suffered from illusions about the League of Nations, tend to focus on the limitations and weaknesses and to overlook the life and potential for growth in the UN. Neither view leads to a balanced understanding of the world agency or to a helpful basis for bringing constructive influences to bear on it.

The organism concept

Perhaps the biological concept of organism can help us to a truer view, which avoids both the illusions of false optimism and the illusions of disillusionment. To begin with, the United Nations is a body made up of related parts which work together from time to time for certain common purposes. As the Cold War has grown more bitter, much doubt has been cast on the extent to which the principles expressed in the

by Richard M. Fagley, Executive Secretary of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches and International Missionary Council. He writes here in his personal capacity.

Charter and in the expanding corpus of UN resolutions are actually shared across the deep lines of division in our world. Ecumenical statements have repeatedly pointed to the lack of any adequate international ethos as a fundamental weakness in regard to international law and institutions. And this lack is intensified by the conflict of governments and ideologies. Yet it seems clear that on the broad purposes of peace and cooperation the *peoples* of the world are much less divided than their governments. The aspirations embodied in the Charter under the impact of war-time sacrifice remain a unitive influence which no Member can wholly ignore.

Like other living organisms, the UN is the sum of its parts, but more than the sum of its parts. It is not a government above the nations, but rather is a mechanism or instrument of joint action and cooperation which the nations can use, neglect, or abuse. Yet it is something more than a mere tool. It has a certain life of its own, its own "personality," if you will, which should not be exaggerated, but also, not be ignored. Those principles of the Charter which have been reinforced by subsequent UN history form part of this "plus" element in the UN. The emerging international civil service on behalf of the Charter, organized under the Office of Secretary-General, forms another.

Nationalism the contemporary secular religion

The modest character of this "plus" can be regarded as a mark of the United Nations' adaptation to its environment, the world of international affairs. Despite efforts to civilize interstate relations, the world of nation-states remains in many basic respects a jungle world of power politics and anarchy. The Charter speaks of the "sovereign equality" of the Members. It is a nice phrase, but does nothing to tame national sovereignty, the still dominant reality of international politics. It is of course true that for most states much of the content of national sovereignty has been eroded by the emergence of the super-powers, with unparalleled concentrations of economic and military might. Yet even the weakest nations are zealous to maintain the remaining tatters of their sovereignty. Nationalism remains the contemporary secular religion.

While the founding fathers at Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco had illusions about the continuation of the war-time

alition as a collective security system, they basically devised the UN as a means of cooperation in a world of sovereign states. In doing so they took into account the hard facts of international life. Advocates of world government have pointed to the fissionable atom and other factors of interdependence in arguing the need for a much greater pooling of sovereignty in a world authority. They are right as to the need. But where are the moral and political foundations sufficient to sustain a world government? Without such common foundations, as churchmen have pointed out, a world government could readily become a world tyranny—if it were a present possibility. No, the founding fathers gave the United Nations a chance to survive by adapting it to its nation-state environment.

Growth essential

Yet adaptation for a living organism is a complex thing. It involves more than a mechanical or static adjustment. It involves the ability to act and to react, to change in relation to a changing environment. Indeed the law of life dictates to institutions as to individuals: unless there is growth, development, adaptation to new conditions, there will be decay, decline, and ultimate death. This point of view was reflected in ecumenical statements about the UN in 1953 and 1954. The Executive Committee of our Commission said, "If it is to live, the United Nations must grow." A year later this judgment was reiterated by the Section on International Affairs at the Evanston Assembly of the World Council of Churches:

The brief history of the United Nations has been one of growth and development, and if it is to live, it must continue to grow.

This is the keystone of the present analysis. During the past sixteen years have there been significant signs of growth in the United Nations, as well as functions which have withered through neglect? Can certain areas be pointed to as growing edges or points for further development? And finally, do the indications add up to a favorable or unfavorable forecast of the UN's survival value? Obviously, the scope of this article as well as my own limitations require a selective and illustrative approach. The main thing is the perspective offered for understanding and evaluating the international organization.

THE FIRST SIXTEEN YEARS

Some of the more important developments in the United Nations took place during its pre-natal period, when the Charter was being revised at San Francisco. The original Dumbarton Oaks proposals of the "Big Four"—Britain, China, U.S.S.R., and U.S.A.—envisaged an organization that was predominantly a league to enforce peace. The heart of it was to be the Security Council based on the concerted might of the Permanent Members, who were also the major powers combined against the Axis. This approach was considerably modified at San Francisco. The General Assembly of all the Members was given greater scope as a forum to discuss and recommend "measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations among nations . . ." (Article 14). It was established as "the town meeting of the world," in Senator Vandenberg's phrase. Also, while the unanimity principle or veto remained applicable to most important Security Council business, Stalin was at last persuaded to agree to its removal from the question of discussing disputes in that organ.

Further, the positive functions of the organization for "harmonizing the actions of nations" on behalf of economic and social welfare were expanded in Chapters IX and X, including work to safeguard human rights, a function for which church representatives had striven. A declaration of obligation toward dependent peoples was included in Chapter XI, together with the more precise commitments of the Trusteeship System in Chapters XII and XIII. All in all, the delegates at San Francisco had labored well. They put together a more democratic and constructive agency, with better potentialities for growth, than had originally been envisaged.

Timing of San Francisco

It is interesting to speculate what changes might have been wrought, had the imminence of the Atomic Age (the blast at Almagordo occurred three weeks after the signing of the Charter) been known and the implications pondered. This awesome symbol of a common fate might have prodded the nations into setting up a stronger organization. On the other hand, the temporary American monopoly might well have strengthened

forces in the U.S. opposed to international cooperation. On balance, much is to be said for the actual timing of the San Francisco Conference. It came when the tide of war-time cooperation and shared sacrifices was at the full. It avoided being linked with ambiguous peace settlements, the curse of the League at Versailles, and it came before the coalition was disrupted by the spoils and suspicions of victory. A different timetable might have been fatal.

The victorious coalition, whose name it continues, was the only possible basis for the United Nations. It was a relatively good basis, in view of the worldwide support for the justice of the Allied cause. Yet the moment of victory, when history moves at an accelerated tempo, is a particularly difficult time to plan for the future. Many of the assumptions at San Francisco were quickly outmoded, as one of the "Permanent Members" was torn by civil war, and the others were divided by the mounting Cold War. Thus, for example, Articles 43-7 spell out arrangements for the earmarking of military contingents to serve under the Security Council with the help of its Military Staff Committee, from the Permanent Members. These provisions, projecting war-time arrangements, quickly became a dead letter. The M.S.C. still meets periodically, and is perhaps the least burdened committee in the world.

The veto

The Permanent Member "veto" in the Security Council has been widely regarded in the West as a major devil in the Charter. Most of the hundred odd "vetoes" have been cast by the Soviet Union. So infrequently has the Security Council been able to act in accordance with the great-power unanimity principle that the peace maintenance arm of the UN has more and more receded into the shadows and the Assembly moved into the limelight. A temporary Soviet boycott of the Security Council in 1950 enabled the Council to act in the Korean crisis. A momentary great power agreement in 1960 provided the basis for UN action in the Congo. Inability to act is a much more common condition.

It should be remembered, however, that the U.S.S.R. was not the only great power insistent on writing the unanimity principle into the Charter. The United States undoubtedly would

not have ratified the Charter if the Security Council could vote military measures without U.S. consent. The heart of the matter is not the veto question, which merely reflects the conflict among the Permanent Members. The heart of the matter is the presupposition in the Charter that the major victor powers would continue to see sufficiently eye to eye on defending the peace and the high purposes written into the Charter to make the UN work. There was no alternative presupposition on which the world organization could have been brought to life. But it has not been supported by events.

Pervasive hostility a source of peril

The profound and pervasive hostility between the Soviet and Western powers is indeed a most serious weakness in the UN, as it is a source of peril in the world. It means that the Security Council cannot be counted on to maintain peace and security. It means that the present prospects for any major revision of the Charter are very dim. It means that the question of the election of a successor to Dag Hammarskjöld as Secretary General may throw the UN into a crisis in 1963. More than a few of the Charter provisions become inoperable without some kind of Soviet-Western agreement.

This is the dark side of the UN picture, which leads some people to regard it as a rather futile operation. Yet if we see the agency as a living institution and judge it in terms of its actual and potential functions rather than in terms of the original presuppositions, a much less gloomy image emerges. It is only in part the UN envisaged at San Francisco. But it is real, and it is important. It gives life and development to some of the principles of the Charter, while others remain disembodied.

International development assistance

To start with some of the less controversial and consequently less publicized work of the UN, there is the valuable international development assistance carried on, in cooperation with the Specialized Agencies, under the management of David Owen and Paul Hoffman. The Expanded Programme and more recently the Special Fund have organized technical assistance projects on a multilateral basis which are appreciated throughout the economically underdeveloped world. While the total is modest,

some \$87 million this year apart from local costs and allocations contributed by recipient countries, the effort over the past decade has set a helpful standard for the burgeoning bilateral programs. Undoubtedly the calibre of this work has done much to enhance the support for the UN in the poorer continents.

Human rights

In a field of especial concern to churchmen, human rights, the major contribution of the UN to date has been the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the General Assembly in 1948. This provides a set of high yet relevant standards to which men of goodwill can repair. Many of the newer constitutions have been influenced by it. The Universal Declaration offers a focus for the kind of education needed to develop a more adequate ethos on the inherent rights and dignity of man. The lack of a common or sufficient "human rights conscience" handicaps the protracted efforts of the Assembly to arrive at significant and legally binding Covenants. The useful work of the UN Commission on the Status of Women should also be mentioned among the constructive efforts for human welfare. The UN is not a government which can pass laws—the work in the field of international law has moved slowly. But when there is significant agreement the UN can help to set up morally and politically influential norms, which can in time pave the way for legal advance.

Anti-colonialism

With the present majority of the 99 UN Members anti-colonialism is a prime tenet of their political faith. The newly independent states accepted for membership (the great powers, competing for influence in these lands of rapid social change, can agree on this) feel a sacred duty to expedite the removal of the remaining vestiges of the Nineteenth Century colonialism. Resolutions pressing for the more rapid advancement of dependent peoples have become ever more numerous, as the membership of the organization has virtually doubled. The first article of both of the draft Covenants on Human Rights affirms the right of national self-determination. Undoubtedly, the effect of the debates and resolutions in the General Assembly has been to give an added push to the nationalist revolution now sweeping through Africa. Indeed the world forum given petitioners

from various territories has had its influence on the leadership of these emergent nations.

The Trusteeship Council is rapidly working itself out of a job, as Trust Territories gain independence in one form or another. Unless other territories are placed under this system, it will soon be impossible to constitute the Council in accordance with Article 86 of the Charter, which provides for an equal division of administering and non-administering countries, with all the Permanent Members included. The Permanent Members in the non-administering category (including France and the U.K.!) will soon outnumber the remaining administering countries. Even now the composition is unconstitutional, since the termination of the French trust agreements.

Some students of the colonial question would argue that the effect of the anti-colonial pressures has been a mixed blessing for the dependent peoples concerned, in that the pursuit of independence has been inadequately related to its economic and social foundations. The latter are currently receiving much more attention than before, in General Assembly appeals for special aid to newly independent states. It seems likely that efforts will also be made to foster greater cooperation among these states for the sake of mutual survival. It is clear that "decolonization" is not more than a partial answer to the full well-being of peoples emerging from the dependent relationship.

Refugees

In the field of refugees, while the massive post-war resettlement programs have largely terminated, the problem has not. The UN High Commissioner for Refugees continues to provide legal and other types of assistance to refugees coming within the scope of his office. He serves as the champion of humane treatment for the uprooted, and calls international attention to problems like that of statelessness, currently the subject of a UN conference. One large-scale program is still operated under UN auspices: the effort to sustain and if possible resettle the Arab refugees. Without adequate financing, UNWRA struggles to keep some life and hope alive among these tragic victims of Middle East tensions.

In all these activities designed to harmonize and concert national actions for human welfare, the United Nations has laid

some rather solid undergirding for the future. Its operations in the non-military field have spoken to the felt needs of men in concrete and helpful ways, and on a far larger scale than was possible under the League of Nations. To many of the new nations, caught in the manifold ferments of revolutionary change, the UN appears in the role of friend and impartial adviser. The response of the emergent peoples provides a support quite different from the great-power agreement originally seen as the bulwark of the organization. The new undergirding is not very strong or stable, because these lands of rapid change are relatively weak and unstable. But since the "in-between" countries are a key target of both the Soviet and Western powers, their loyalty to the UN serves as a kind of cement to hold the divided membership together.

Security achievements

In the military and security area, the United Nations has its achievements as well as failures to record. It helped to bring about a withdrawal of Soviet troops from Iran, to achieve a pacification between Greece and its neighbors to the north, to effect a truce between India and Pakistan in Kashmir, to mediate the conflict between the Netherlands and Indonesia from which emerged an independent Indonesia, to achieve and maintain the 1949 armistice agreements between Israel and her Arab neighbors. A major test of the UN was the military aggression in Korea in 1950. The Security Council's call for collective measures against the aggressor was made possible by Soviet absence from the Council table. The aggression was eventually frustrated, at a high cost in human lives. The costs involved in a successful aggression could have been very much higher.

Uniting for Peace procedure

The precarious circumstances under which the UN acted in the Korean crisis led the General Assembly in 1950 to adopt the important Uniting for Peace resolution. Under this, a procedure was set up for calling an emergency special session of the Assembly, in cases when the Security Council was unable to act. One feature of the resolution, originally proposed by the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs officers and adopted unanimously by the Assembly, was the establishment

of a Peace Observation Commission to be available to areas of tension: by its presence it could help to discourage aggression, or identify the aggressor if it came to that.

The Uniting for Peace procedure provides an alternative means for bringing pressure on countries threatening the peace, when the Security Council is deadlocked—a condition calculated to prevail in most situations involving Soviet-Western tensions. The Assembly cannot act in the sense of ordering any country to do anything. It can only recommend. However, when the Assembly recommends with a sufficiently concerted and firm voice, the moral suasion involved has important political or even military overtones. It is noteworthy that during the past sixteen years all of the major powers have found it expedient from time to time to modify their policies in the face of General Assembly positions.

Moral influence

A true assessment of the UN must reckon with such intangible factors for peace as the moral influence of the Assembly when it overwhelmingly agrees. In the Suez crisis, such a consensus, importantly reinforced by segments of domestic public opinion, led to a change in British, French, and Israeli policy. In the almost simultaneous Hungarian crisis, the Soviet Union defied the UN consensus. This instance has been cited as disproof of the importance of the Assembly process. But it is not claimed that this process is sure, particularly against one of the super-powers. Rather, it is asserted that an Assembly consensus is significant, and the price paid by the U.S.S.R. for its defiance in areas where it seeks friends and influence, testifies to that. The moral influence of the Assembly, when generated by broadly held convictions, is one of the important defenses of peace in the minds of men—a sector which even the super-powers dare not ignore.

Over-all pattern—growth

The first sixteen years have had their ups and downs, their advances and setbacks, but the over-all pattern has been one of growth. In general, the organization has adapted itself to a divided world largely within the UN the founding fathers did not anticipate. It has moved forward in the non-military areas in constructive ways. It has improvised in security issues with

imperfect success, but with reasonable assurance that the crises would have posed graver threats to both peace and justice had not the UN attempted to bring its influence to bear. No tangible or clear progress has been made on the critical issues of disarmament, but at least the UN debates have kept strong the world demand for such progress. Potential headway has been made in other respects as noted below. All in all, the record of the initial years offers ground for a positive judgment on the vitality of the new institution.

GROWING EDGES FOR THE FUTURE

To attempt a brief look ahead for the United Nations involves projecting certain present or incipient trends into the future. The purpose is to indicate a few of the new adaptations which can be developed provided there is sufficient public opinion behind them, not to predict what will happen. Some of the dangerous trends must also be noted for a balanced picture.

A UN presence

Some of the brighter spots in the UN record are constituted by undertakings to station a "UN presence" in certain troubled spots to help reduce the danger of incidents or more serious disorder. The form has differed according to circumstances: peace observers on the Greek side of the Balkan border, the truce supervisions in Korea and the Near East, later UNEF between Israel and the U.A.R., a representative of the Secretary General in Laos, peace observers in Lebanon, and the relatively large UN force in the Congo. The rapid organization of UNEF during the Suez crisis was a particularly bright page in the UN story. The Congo operation has had a much more difficult time in striving to establish order out of virtual chaos.

These various types of UN presence, ranging from a single observer to a force of some 18,000 men, illustrate flexibility and initiative on the part of the UN and its Secretariat in the field of machinery for peaceful settlement. Also the decisions of the Assembly to assess Members for the costs of UNEF and the Congo operation in accordance with the regular scale of assessments, gives added weight to the actions taken. The end of this story, however, is not yet in sight. The Soviet bloc, for example, has refused to pay its share of either budget, which helps to

cause financial difficulty for the UN, and to pose a possible political crisis if and when unpaid assessments totalling more than twice the regular assessment are cited as grounds for depriving Soviet Members of their votes in the Assembly under Article 19. That the UN as a whole should pay for the machinery of peaceful settlement it establishes is an important issue.

The need for more reliable and automatic procedures for peaceful settlement and peaceful change (the plebiscite under UN supervision is an example of the latter) has been stressed by the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs Executive and the Central Committee of the World Council, as well as by the Fifth U.S. World Order Study Conference in the U.S. Commitments by Members to admit UN observers are needed in advance of a crisis, when any move may be feared by the party threatened. An initiative free from any veto needs to be granted a standing body or to the Secretary General. The development of more trustworthy machinery for peaceful settlement and change is one of the potential growing edges of the world agency. The issue is linked with that of international inspection, so essential to genuine progress in the field of disarmament.

Secretary General's position weakened

If the Secretary General had not come under Soviet attack, following developments in the Congo contrary to Soviet interests, one might have anticipated a promising continued growth of peace-making functions under this important Office. Mr. Hammarskjold, by the exercise of quiet diplomacy as well as administration of tasks put on his desk, has considerably enhanced the prestige of this Office and given life to powers inherent in the Charter. The Soviet attack, and "troika" proposal for a three-headed Secretariat, has destroyed a major foundation for the effectiveness of the S.G.—the at least tacit confidence of the principal powers. While the "troika" proposal, calculated to bring the Office of S.G. under political control as contrasted with control by the principles and procedures of the Charter, has not won any significant support outside the Soviet bloc, the potentialities of the S.G.'s position have undoubtedly been weakened.

In defending the Office Mr. Hammarskjold has turned to the "in-between" countries for support. Much depends on how the

smaller powers and the newer nations respond. "Neutralist" is the most common term for the rather amorphous majority of Members not committed to either major power bloc. Insofar as neutralism means no more than independence from the great powers, there is a fighting chance for the UN to grow stronger and more significant under the current pressures. If the concept should come to mean a neutral attitude toward the principles of the Charter—such as regarding the proposed reorganization of the Secretary General's Office as a "cold war" issue—then the future prospects for the United Nations would become rather bleak. The months ahead will constitute a real time of testing for many new and rather inexperienced governments. Strange as it would have seemed sixteen years ago, a good deal of the UN future is in their hands.

Expansion of membership

The growth of the UN membership since 1955 has very considerably enlarged the forum provided for the world's "town meeting." Some Soviet-Western package deals on membership plus the accelerated tempo of emancipation account for the expansion. The newly independent countries, for whose support the power blocs contend, normally find the welcome mat in place. The case has been different for Mainland China, Outer Mongolia, and the divided countries: Germany, Korea, Vietnam. The pressures for greater universality seem likely to mount. It is pointed out, for example, that no considerable progress can be made toward disarmament without the concurrence of Communist China; and that the disciplines of membership can exercise some influence on its policy. On the other hand, it is argued that a regime which holds that "war is the highest form of class struggle" (article in *Jenmin Jih Pao*, quoted in *The New York Times* of 15 August 1961) can hardly be said to pursue objectives consonant with the obligations of UN membership. The impact of Chinese Communist accreditation, when it occurs, poses a very considerable question-mark for the UN.

The expanded membership makes the UN procedures more cumbersome and less predictable. It tends to water down resolutions on most controversial subjects in the search for a broad enough common denominator. On the other hand it offers a larger megaphone for the leaders of government, and when a

genuine consensus is arrived at, it has a larger effect. Critics focus on the various propaganda tactics used in the protracted Assembly debates. They would do better to focus on the innumerable consultations taking place in the lobbies and embassies by which the delegates try to advance their countries' interests and to find common ground. The Assembly is an important propaganda forum—and that is not unimportant. But it is more than that. It is a day to day exercise in multilateral diplomacy and a search for acceptable solutions. The klieg lights testify to the growing attention to the UN among the peoples.

Enlarged regional cooperation

The continued growth of Assembly agendas, as more and more issues are added, makes it increasingly difficult especially for the smaller and newer countries to do their paper work and consulting. Some effort to decentralize has been made, as in efforts to strengthen the regional economic commissions, the holding of regional seminars and the like. If this is a direction in which the UN continues to move, it could ease some of the present burdens. There is much to be said for handling more international business at the regional level. This is particularly the case in view of the need for greater regional cooperation if many of the newer countries are to prove viable.

Strategy of economic and social development

One of the potential growing edges of the UN is in regard to the over-all strategy of economic and social development. While the agency has done a useful job in organizing multilateral assistance, it has hitherto largely neglected its broader responsibility to help correlate and review the much larger bilateral programs. Governments have not been eager to subject their own undertakings to international scrutiny and advice. Yet the way to secure more effective aid for the underdeveloped countries lies in this direction.

Creative opportunity

These are a few of the signs which point toward a future uncertain but not without promise or hope. The fact that the United Nations has thus far proved sufficiently adaptable to meet, if not always to best, the multiple challenges of the post-war world augurs well. There is life in the institution which can

mean continued evolution of powers inherent in the Charter or delegated to the organization by common consent. Whether this evolution is taking place at a rapid enough pace to lead the nations in coping with unmet problems like the population explosion or the control of outer space is quite another matter. One would be foolish to make optimistic predictions. But there is at least a creative opportunity.

To strengthen the potentialities of the UN depends in part on the wisdom and resoluteness of governments. But it also depends upon the loyalty and interest of the peoples. As Cordell Hull stated at the outset of the present adventure in international cooperation: "No piece of social machinery, however well constructed, can be effective unless there is back of it a will and determination to make it work." In the end this is a matter of the convictions of individual men and women. This is where the churches, from the parish level to the world level, find a primary responsibility.

- + + + + + + + + + + + +

The United Nations is the symbol and the central instrument of a community of interest and service that includes all mankind. It is indispensable to world peace and order and to progress toward world community. The organization should move toward universality of membership, and the policies and actions of all nations should increasingly be brought under its examination.

The member nations should in every possible way and area make the United Nations the chief instrument of concerting and executing international policies. We would also call attention to the probability that, with the great increase in membership, proposals brought to the United Nations by the United States may be subject to increasing criticism and even rejection. We warn against any tendency, for such reason, to weaken United States loyalty to the organization.

—From the STATEMENT ON NATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS adopted by the General Synod of the United Church of Christ, July 7, 1961



TO SEE MORE CLEARLY AND JUDGE MORE WISELY

Some grim and discouraging days lie ahead for the UN. In addition to thorny political problems such as China, Portuguese Angola, South Africa and Congo, the Sixteenth General Assembly has certain basic problems with which it must deal. The import of these problems will not be easily understood by the citizen. For the most part he must rely on the judgment of the government officials and technicians who have been selected to deal with them.

Certainly a major task of the international organization is the building of respect and responsibility among its members. This is a long, hard job, but there are signs of a certain *esprit*. With several dramatic exceptions, there has been an acceptance of procedures and code of behavior on the part of the delegates. But it has been far too easy for members to vote resolutions of high principle and fail to take enabling financial action. The present financial crisis may force members to take a long hard look at the UN and decide whether they want it or not.

In the previous session of the General Assembly the Afro-Asians joined with others in

soundly rejecting proposals to weaken the office of the Secretary General, clearly indicating the great value they place upon the UN. Americans, too, have held that the UN is vital to our interests. One must ask oneself, however: Will U.S. faith in the UN continue if we lose in voting on issues we feel strongly about (China)? So while we have a deep faith in the UN we see stormy days ahead. The following publications can help thoughtful Americans see these problems more clearly and exercise judgment more prudently.

The United Nations and How It Works, by David Cushman Coyle, 2d edition. New York: Columbia University Press, 1961, \$3.75. (Paperback—New York: New American Library, 50¢.)

This is an excellent basic volume. In it one finds brief discussion of all the specialized agencies, as well as the structure of the United Nations. Mr. Coyle, a long-time student of the UN, is not one to despair of the UN. In his own words:

If there is any hope of avoiding the end of the world, and if there is any way that the human race can ride out the great revolutions of our day and

live, those ways are most likely to be found in the slow, painful but determined labors of the United Nations of the world.

The General Assembly, by Sidney Bailey. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1960, \$5.

A scholarly and authoritative analysis of the General Assembly has been needed ever since it replaced the Security Council as the dominant UN body. We are grateful to the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace for sponsoring the author's studies and the publication of this volume. One chapter, "The Question of Tibet: A Case Study," is a remarkable illustration of the intricacies of international politics in the General Assembly. Mixed morality, subtle and not so subtle national motives, parliamentary maneuvering, and the unvoiced, but ever present, threat of force by a big power are all laid bare. Mr. Bailey is a realist. He realizes that the UN is a machinery for accommodation. As he says, "in contentious questions of a political or quasi-political nature the primary task is to cause an improvement in the situation rather than to place on the public record the views of Member States." Americans and others might do well to discipline themselves in the light of the author's concern about "the temptation to cover the incapacities to deal with one's own problems by moralizing about others."

The United Nations and U.S. Foreign Policy, by Lincoln P. Bloomfield. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1960., \$4.75.

We know of no other work that analyzes so well the relation of U.S. foreign policy goals to the United Nations. Mr. Bloomfield writes objectively and clearly. He has profound insight with a keen awareness of the frequent conflict of idealism and our national interest—e.g., the problem of anti-colonization as against the retention of the friendship of NATO allies. In the end, the author concludes that the UN "symbolizes the sweep of our vision of a more perfect union, and it challenges anew our capacity to make plans befitting that vision and our will to transform those plans into reality." We hope the State Department has this for required reading.

Embassy Extraordinary, by John MacVane. New York: Public Affairs Pamphlets, 1961, 25¢.

Few people understand the complex structure of the U.S. Mission to the United Nations. The author has done a fine job of detailing simply and clearly this diplomatic arm of the U.S. at the UN, its relation to the Department of State, its internal division of authority and the part it plays in the success or failure of U.S. policy.

By John R. Inman, Associate Executive Director, The Church Peace Union, 170 E. 64th Street, New York 21, N. Y.



TO WORK FOR UNDERSTANDING

One of the outstanding organizations which can supply resources and suggestions for program planning related to the United Nations is the **American Association for the United Nations**, 345 East 46th Street, New York 17, N. Y. Check your calendar for observance of United Nations Week, OCTOBER 22-28; and UN Day, OCTOBER 24, as immediate opportunities to translate beliefs into action. Among the ways suggested are:

- Plan a UN meeting.
- Schedule a speaker on the UN for your church club.
- Invite an exchange student or teacher to your home.
- Write a letter to the editor of your newspaper calling attention to the accomplishments of the UN.
- Organize a study group among your friends to learn about the problems that are before us in the UN.
- Know your UN facts so you can correct misstatements about the UN.
- Serve an International Meal for your family and friends.
- Buy UNESCO Gift Coupons, a kind of "international money order" that gives you a share in helping those who want to escape from ignorance.

• Learn about the "Freedom from Hunger" Campaign being conducted by the UN Food and Agriculture Organization to find out how you can help.

• Take part in the community programs for the UN Children's Fund (UNICEF) that bring health to the world's needy children.

• Buy and donate books on the UN to your public and school libraries.

• Ask your clergyman to relate one or more of his October sermons to the moral and spiritual concept of the UN.

• Write the Merchants' Association to suggest that window displays in the stores be concentrated on a UN theme related to their specific products.

• Call upon the teachers to plan school assemblies on a topic such as "The UN Is 16 Today" or "The Issues Before the UN."

• Urge your radio and television station managers to carry programs from the United Nations offered to them by UN Headquarters.

The AAUN also provides leaflet material answering your questions about the UN. They have a catalogue of films and filmstrips. Some of these are:

Workshop for Peace. A complete tour of the UN Headquarters in New York. Also shows the General Assembly in Action and how the Secretary-General and the UN Staff carry on their day-to-day activities. Running time: 29 mins. Rental: \$7.50.*

This Is the Challenge. Shows the disastrous effects of wars during the 20th Century and how people can and must work together for peace. Running time: 10 mins. Rental: \$2.50.* (1952)

Philippines—Social Progress. Shows how the people of this island-nation have been helped to better health and education by UN agencies and through their own initiative. Running time: 10 mins. Rental: \$2.50.*

They recommend speakers, can provide a publications list and information on the specialized agencies. Their little pamphlet on "UN Action is Action for Peace" gives an impressive summary of UN accomplishments since its founding and helps dispel discouragement.

The Foreign Policy Association at the same address as the AAUN provides pertinent information in its publications regarding the work of the UN and its problems. One of their

pamphlets on the U.S. Mission is reviewed in this issue. (See p. 31.)

Some states have World Affairs Centers which provide speakers, films, and pamphlets. Try to pay travel and fees for speakers when you can—or get the material and become an expert yourself.

Mr. Creighton Fritchey, Public Relations for the U.S. Mission, and Mr. Harry Seamans, Liaison Officer for Voluntary Organizations, the Department of State, Washington, D. C., will be glad to direct you to resources that are relevant.

Remember that the work of the UN is a year-round effort and our support must be continuing. Study U.S. foreign policy in relation to the UN, write letters when you feel the nation's leadership is bypassing the UN and acting unilaterally on issues when this is unwise. Social action committees might set up forums or symposiums to inform church members of the issues before the UN, and the need for citizen support.

Use the resources of your area—for example, state university extension people, teachers, journalists, ministers, persons who have attended UN seminars or participated in study tours, etc. Recruit people for the UN seminars, study tours, churchmen's seminars on government, and social action institutes, where these and relevant issues are discussed.

—E.J.

* Available from Contemporary Films, Inc., 267 West 25th St., New York 1, N. Y., or regional offices in Illinois and California.



Hymns

The New World (from *The Creation*)
God of Grace and God of Glory
Jesus Shall Reign Where'er the Sun
God of Nations, Near and Far
Turn Back, O Man
Thy Kingdom Come, O Lord
The Voice of God is Calling
Joy to the World

Scripture

Micah 4:1-7
Amos 5:21-24
Isaiah 61:1-4
Matt. 25:31-46
Luke 19:41-44
Acts 17:22-31

LITANY

Almighty Father, source of all life, Lord of all men and nations, we lift before thee the amazing events of our time, praying for understanding and courage. Before the wonderful story of life, from lowliest beginnings to the triumphs of human mind and hand in our time,

We bow in wonder and reverence.

For the unceasing quest for knowledge, the striving for justice, the search for brotherhood and peace,

We give thee thanks.

For new visions of the possibility of a better life for all men, for the breaking down of old barriers between nations, classes and races, for a new spirit among men that rejects submission to unnecessary privation and suffering,

We give heartfelt thanks.

For the variety and richness of human life, to which men of many races and nations may now increasingly contribute, and for all inventions and institutions that help men to speak to one another and to share their experience and insight,

We lift up our hearts in thanksgiving.

From all blind clinging to familiar customs, from fear of the new and the strange, from hasty rejection of ways that are not our ways,

Deliver us, O Lord.

From the pride of nation or race or religion that makes us indifferent or hostile toward people of other nations, races and religions and that impoverishes their life and ours,

Deliver us, O Lord.

Wherever men struggle against
poverty, sickness, ignorance,

There let our hearts be!

Wherever men fight against
front to their human dignity,
against being used for the bene-
fit of others, against injustice
and tyranny,

There let our hearts be!

We pray for all new institu-
tions intended to meet the needs
of men in our changing world.
Especially we pray for the
United Nations that it may more
and more become an instrument
of mutual aid and of peace,

*Hear us, good Lord, and bless
this endeavor.*

When men of many nations,

great and small, meet to con-
sult, to overcome their separate-
ness, to lift the burden of arma-
ments, to substitute reason and
law for resort to war,

*Help us O Lord to be glad
and to support their endeavors.*

(All praying together)

Grant, we beseech thee, our
Father that we who in our time
have devised new and terrible
instruments of destruction may
be resolute in devising new and
beneficent instruments of serv-
ice to men, that thy people may
live in peace and thy purpose
for them be fulfilled. We pray
in the name of Jesus Christ our
Lord. Amen.

—HERMAN F. REISSIG

AS A BASIS FOR MEDITATION

The following excerpt from our General Synod STATEMENT
ON NATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS*
could well be used in a service of worship:

As Christians, we hold these truths to be unquestionable:

That every nation exists "under God," subject to His
judgments and obliged to serve His purposes;

That the nation exists for man, not man for the nation;

That the central truth about every person is the worth
given to him by the Creator of all life;

That concern for the neighbor transcends national
boundaries;

That national power and wealth are a trust, to be ad-
ministered in the service of man;

That freedom is not an end in itself but is tested by the
way it is used to promote the growth of persons in service
to God and man. These truths have meaning for the United
States in the present world situation.



- OCTOBER 17-19 World Order and United Nations Seminar, New York. Leader: The Rev. Herman F. Reissig. (Enrollment limited to about 100 persons.)
- OCTOBER 22 World Order Sunday—"Christian Responsibility and a World of Law."
- OCTOBER 22-27 National Study Conference on The Churches and Social Welfare, Cleveland, Ohio.
- OCTOBER 22-28 United Nations Week.
- OCTOBER 24 United Nations Day.
- FEBRUARY 11, 1962 Race Relations Sunday.
- FEBRUARY 27-
MARCH 2, 1962 Churchmen's Washington Seminar, Washington, D. C. Applications should be sent to Dr. Lewis I. Maddocks, c/o National Council of Churches, 122 Maryland Ave. N.E., Washington 2, D.C. (United Church quota limited to 42 persons.)
-